# E CORPORATED TO THE SERVICE OF THE S

#### MINUTES OF THE

### **Edina Transportation Commission**

Thursday, April 28, 2005 Edina City Hall 4801 West 50<sup>th</sup> Street Community Room

#### **MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Fred Richards, Marie Thorpe, Jean White, Warren Plante, Joni Kelly Bennett, Les Wanninger

#### **MEMBERS ABSENT:**

**Dean Dovolis** 

#### STAFF PRESENT:

Steve Lillehaug, Sharon Allison

#### I. Call to Order

Chair Richards called the meeting to order.

#### II. New Business

a. Handouts

<u>Summary of Transportation Choices 2020 Initiative (Handout provided by Commissioner White)</u>

White explained that Edina's State Representative Erhardt authored a transportation bill, which would create a dedicated source of funding for transit much the same like roadway funding. White said the bill is connected to ETC's policy items #9 (encouraging legislature to increase funding) and #10 (having park and ride locations close to mass transit). Thorpe said it would also affect pedestrians.

White said more money is spent on parking than on roads in the twin cities area, as well as subsidies for cars and roads and this would be a shift toward putting more money in transit, but not taking away from current expenditures for roads. White said this would create a multi-modal transportation system. She said other cities are having success with a similar approach. White would like the ETC to discuss and support the 20/20 plan.

During the discussion, many questions were raised, some of which could not be answered immediately. Some responses to the 20/20 plan thus far are as follow: not in agreement with increasing taxes (Plante); not in agreement with dedicated funding source because if not secured by constitution it could be changed by future legislatures; and why not use bonding? (Wanninger); White will research answers to the questions that were raised.

# <u>Traffic Study Initiation and Review Policy (for development and zoning applications)</u>

Lillehaug said two new items were added: #5 under Initiation of a Traffic Study and #4 under Traffic Study Findings of Fact, as recommended by the Commission. Bennett suggested rewording item #5 by deleting 'In an instance in which' and starting the sentence with

'<u>D</u>evelopment or...' In items #1 and #2 under Traffic Study Findings of Fact, change 'affect' to 'effect.'

Lillehaug explained that the Traffic Study Initiation and Review Policy is a guide to help determine when a traffic study would be needed and is intended to be used only when development and zoning applications are received by the Planning Department. Lillehaug said the City typically initiates traffic studies and trip generation would be a defining parameter for doing them. He said he would like the ETC to leave some flexibility to staff to determine when a study is or isn't needed. Richards said if the ETC did this, it would be staff driven and the need for the ETC would no longer exist. Lillehaug suggested that the ETC not react to the policy tonight and allow him to research more and revise the policy to include traffic studies based on trip generation.

After a lengthy discussion of the Traffic Study Initiation and Review Policy regarding whether the ETC should identify areas needing traffic studies (proactive) or wait until re/development application is received (reactive), and who determines when a study should be done (staff vs. ETC), the following motion was made by Wanninger and seconded by White:

Motion to adopt the Traffic Study Initiation and Review Policy with the following changes:

Initiation of Traffic Study: strike items i to iii; from item iv delete the words 'Final,' 'Plan' and '(non-single family residential); from item v delete 'In an instance in which' and begin with 'Development or...'

Bennett suggested the following amendment to the motion: change item iv to read 'Development Plan or conditional use permit approvals where an increase....' The amendment failed for lack of a second.

Aves: 5

Nayes: 1 (Plante) Motion carried.

#### <u>Transportation Commission Schedule</u>

Beginning with the May meeting, the ETC will meet every third Thursday of the month. This a switch from the fourth Thursday of the month. Lillehaug said a joint meeting to discuss the Southdale redevelopment project is being planned with the Council, the Planning Commission and the ETC. Commissioners will be notified of the date, time and location. On May 19<sup>th</sup> MnDOT will be meeting with the City seeking Municipal Consent for TH494 and TH169 project.

# <u>Correspondence – Traffic Signals (Received from Commissioner Bennett)</u>

Lillehaug said majority of the traffic signals within the City belong to other agencies, the City operates only thirteen. He said most of the signals are timed in conjunction with sensors in the roadway activating the signal to minimize delay. The County monitors signals on France Avenue and they have the ability to make adjustments instantaneously. Lillehaug said he does not see a problem with the current operation of traffic signals. Bennett said the correspondence is from someone who is frustrated with the operation of the signals and that she has not personally observed any problems.

#### <u>City of Edina Transportation Commission Policy – April 2005</u>

Richards suggested creating a brochure for distribution to the residents to make them aware of the policy. Plante suggested using the Edina Sun and Wanninger suggested posting the information on the web as well. Staff was instructed to research different styles/types of

brochures for Commissioners to review. Staff will work with the City's Communication Director and the Edina Sun to formulate a plan for dissemination of information. Commissioners will revisit this at their June meeting.

#### III. Old Business

a. NTMP Scoring and Ranking / Consideration of NTMP Studies to Pursue Lillehaug reported that the NTMP Scoring and Ranking was revised to include W. 56<sup>th</sup> St., the entire northeast Edina area and north Schaefer Rd. (application received). He said as discussed before, Gleason and Valley View Rd. is not suitable for the NTMP process because the problem is not a traffic calming issue, it is more of a traffic safety and capacity issue. In terms of ranking, the High School Area is ranked number one, followed by the northeast Edina area.

Lillehaug said the next step for the NTMP process is to identify the benefited area, develop the Petition-to-Study, which would include identifying the issues and the issue areas, and distribute the Petition-to-Study to the benefited area to get their feedback. In the case of northeast Edina and the High School areas, Lillehaug said it is necessary to identify the issues and areas because ranking and scoring the entire areas, as a whole will not work well in the NTMP process. The NTMP process will work for the other areas that are scored and ranked (Parkwood/Knolls area, View Ln. and Schaefer Rd., W. 56<sup>th</sup> St. and north Schaefer Rd.). Lillehaug recommended proceeding with one or two of the topped ranked qualifying NTMP studies but indicated that it is not advisable at this time to do all four areas due to budget and staff constraints. Lillehaug indicated that a work plan would be put together to address the mentioned traffic study areas and the NTMP studies.

After some discussion in which some Commissioners discussed how to go about selecting the areas to start with, Richards reminded the Commissioners that a process was developed to make such decisions and after spending 14 months developing the policy, it is not going to be thrown out so quickly. Richards said based on the policy, the areas to start with are determined based on their ranking and cost is passed on to the benefited property owners. Richards said they are confusing traffic studies with traffic management and if the Commissioners believe a study is needed, they should not wrestle with whether or not it fits in the budget, instead, let the Council decide.

Thorpe made a motion to work on Gleason and Valley View Rd. followed by the northeast Edina area. Seconded by Wanninger. After further discussion Wanninger withdrew his support. White then seconded the motion.

Ayes: 2 (Thorpe, White)

Naves: 4

Motion failed for lack of support.

Wanninger made a motion to start with Gleason & Valley View Road (High School area). Seconded by Plante.

Ayes: 5 Nayes:

Abstaining: 1 (Thorpe)

## IV. Approval of Minutes

Amendment to page 4, paragraph 1: "Bennett said the number of vehicles is over what some members of ETC said is unacceptable..." Plante motioned to amend the minutes as stated by Bennett. Seconded by Thorpe.

Meeting adjourned. The next meeting is scheduled for May 19<sup>th</sup>, 6:00-8:00 p.m., in the Community Room, City Hall.